

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

**ROGER DANIEL NASH,**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**SCOTT CROW, DOC Director,**

**Respondent.**


**Case No. 20-CV-406-JFH-KEW**

**OPINION AND ORDER  
DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

On February 8, 2021, Petitioner filed a motion for appointment of counsel [Dkt. No. 11]. He bears the burden of convincing the Court that his claim has sufficient merit to warrant such appointment. *McCarthy v. Weinberg*, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985) (citing *United States v. Masters*, 484 F.2d 1251, 1253 (10th Cir. 1973)). The Court has carefully reviewed the merits of Petitioner's claims, the nature of factual issues raised in his allegations, and his ability to investigate crucial facts. *McCarthy*, 753 F.2d at 838 (citing *Maclin v. Freake*, 650 F.2d 885, 887-88 (7th Cir. 1981)). After considering Petitioner's ability to present his claims and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims, the Court finds that appointment of counsel is not warranted. *See Williams v. Meese*, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991); *see also Rucks v. Boergermann*, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995).

THEREFORE, Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel [Dkt. No. 11] is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 25th day of February 2021.



---

JOHN F. HEIL, III  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE